



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## THE INSTITUTE OF POLITICS

**Organization and Methods.** The Institute of Politics, held at Williamstown, Massachusetts, during the month of August, originated in a proposal made in 1913 by President Garfield of Williams College to the trustees of that institution. The plans of President Garfield were followed so faithfully in the final establishment and operation of the Institute that no separate description of those plans is needed here. Through the generosity of Mr. Barnard M. Baruch, who responded cordially to President Garfield's invitation to supply the funds needed for the project, and the liberality of the trustees of Williams College, the original conception was given complete fruition. Mr. Baruch's support was, moreover, pledged for the first three sessions of the Institute, thus making certain that meetings will be held in 1922 and 1923.

The work of the Institute was performed under President Garfield's direction, assisted by Mr. W. E. Hoyt, treasurer of Williams College, and Professors Weston and McLaren, also of Williams, and by a board of advisors among whom were Professors Taft, Coolidge, P. M. Brown, Moore, and W. W. Willoughby and Dr. J. B. Scott. Its object was—and will continue to be—to promote the study of international affairs.

The activities of the Institute were inaugurated by opening exercises in Grace Hall on July 29, when addresses were delivered by President Garfield, Chief Justice Taft, President Lowell, and Mayor Peters of Boston.

The work of the Institute during its first session fell into three divisions, namely, lectures, conferences, and outside activities. Of these briefly in their turn.

There were delivered, by distinguished European publicists, during the four weeks of the Institute, some fifty formal lectures on international questions grouped into six courses. The titles of the lecture courses and the names of the lecturers follow:

I. International Relations of the Old World States in their Historical, Political, Commercial, Legal, and Ethical Aspects, including a Discussion of the Causes of Wars and the Means of Averting Them. The Right Honorable Viscount James Bryce.

II. Russia's Foreign Relations During the last Half Century. The Right Honorable Baron Sergius A. Korff.

III. Near Eastern Affairs and Conditions. The Honorable Stephen Panaretoff.

IV. The Place of Hungary in European History. The Right Honorable Count Paul Teleki.

V. Modern Italy: Its Intellectual, Cultural and Financial Aspects. The Right Honorable Tommaso Tittoni.

VI. The Economic Factor in International Relations. Professor Achille Viallate.

The round table conferences, led by distinguished American scholars, were arranged in eight groups. They were conducted by the leaders and assisted by the secretaries named below:

I. *New States of Central Europe*. Leaders: Professors A. C. Coolidge and R. H. Lord of Harvard. Secretary: Professor Laurence Packard of Rochester.

II. *The Reparations Question*. Leader: Norman H. Davis. Secretary: Arthur Bullard.

III. *Treaty of Versailles*. Leader: Professor J. W. Garner of Illinois. Secretary: Professor Pitman B. Potter of Wisconsin.

IV. *New Frontiers in Europe and the Near East*. Leaders: Professor C. H. Haskins of Harvard; Colonel Lawrence Martin. Secretary: Professor Laurence Packard of Rochester.

V. *Fundamental Concepts in International Law*. Leader: Professor J. S. Reeves of Michigan. Secretary: Lloyd Haberly of Harvard.

VI. *Latin American Questions*. Leader: Director L. S. Rowe of the Pan American Union. Secretary: W. P. Montgomery of the Pan American Union.

VII. *Tariff Problems*. Leader: Professor F. W. Taussig of Harvard. Secretary: R. L. Masson of Harvard.

VIII. *Unsettled Questions in International Law*. Leader: Professor G. G. Wilson of Harvard. Secretary: Lloyd Haberly of Harvard.

The lectures were intended primarily for the members of the Institute, for whom seats were accordingly reserved. But they were, nevertheless, open to the public and were largely attended by visitors. The conferences were intended solely for those members of the Institute enrolled in them. Each member was expected to enroll in two, and only two, conferences. The result was that each conference contained some twenty-five or thirty members. The lectures were delivered in Grace Hall at 11.15 A. M. and 8.15 P. M., and were of an hour's duration.

Conferences were held in four different buildings of Williams College at 9 A. M. and 2:30 P. M., and lasted from one and one half to two hours each, depending upon the inclination of the leader, the subject up for discussion, and the amount of discussion which developed. Ample supplies of books and documents were available for the use of members of the conferences as a result of the generosity and foresight of those in charge of the Institute and the staff of the Williams College library.

The conferences were conducted in some cases as lecture-and-discussion groups, in other cases as seminars with reports by members of the conference and general discussion based thereon. In the former case distinguished visitors were often invited to be present and address the conference; certain of the lecturers attended the conferences from time to time and spoke briefly. The bulk of the work was, however, done by the members of the conferences, who were provided by the secretaries with outlines, bibliographies, and reading references on the topics coming up for discussion. Here also the discussions centered upon the most critical international problems of the day.

The members of the Institute numbered one hundred and thirty-eight. About one quarter of these were women. Substantially all of the members were thirty-five years of age or over. About one-half were academic people of one grade or another, including three college presidents and forty-seven teachers of professorial rank. Professional life contributed some fifty lawyers, diplomats, clergymen, lecturers, authors, and journalists. The army and navy sent four general staff men; a few Asiatic students—Indian, Chinese, and Japanese—were present; and a few business men. All of these paid a nominal fee of ten dollars for the privilege of taking part in the work of the Institute.

The members came chiefly from one section of the United States, as is shown by the following list:

Massachusetts.....	45
New York.....	35
Northeastern United States (not included above).....	21
Washington, D. C.....	8
Southern United States.....	5
Middle West.....	11
Far West.....	2
Asia.....	5
Europe.....	4
Latin America.....	2

The members were provided with good board and comfortable rooms in the college buildings at very reasonable rates. Those in charge even went so far as to provide these accommodations to members of the families of the lecturers, leaders, secretaries, and members. The faculty club opened its doors to all Institute visitors. Everyone was made as comfortable as possible.

Mention of living quarters in Williamstown leads directly to the outside activities of the members of the Institute. Of these, the principal one was conversation. At all times and places, but particularly at table in the Commons dining hall and in the reception room adjoining the dining hall, during the hours following lunch and dinner, there developed an active and serious yet very interesting and lively conversation where lecturers, leaders, secretaries, and members participated freely and equally, in casual and informal attempts to thresh out the truth about the Coto region, the codification of international law, the waterways clauses of the treaty, or the Baranya.

Not all of the conversation turned on international relations, of course. For there were plenty of opportunities for hill climbing in the Berkshires, for tennis on the college courts and golf on the links of the hospitable Taconic Country Club, for dancing, and for motoring over the Mohawk Trail and the other fine roads about Williamstown. A useful guide book was furnished to the members giving full directions for walks to Petersburg Pass, Tri-State Corner, Greylock, and other points of interest. The organ recitals given on Sunday afternoons and the numerous teas and receptions held in the afternoons during the session should also be remembered. But space does not permit, and dignity forbids, us to dwell on the many trips to the Post Office, the antics of the amplifier in Grace Hall, or the familiar doings of some of the *caractères célèbres* among the leaders and members of the Institute.

In retrospect it was felt that the one hundred and forty hours of work in the conferences contributed about one half of the value of the Institute, and the fifty hours of lectures and the outside activities about one quarter each in the total.

The Institute may be examined from two points of view. We may judge the result to see how far it met the plans of those in charge; and we may judge the plans of those in charge, as manifested in the result, to see whether they were all that could be desired.

Judged by the former standard, the first session was a thorough success. Those in charge had planned the operations of the session completely in advance and, as was frequently noted by members,

"everything went like clock work" as a result. The scheduled program was executed smoothly and thoroughly. When changes were needed they were made, promptly and effectively.

Some details might be mentioned wherein all was not perfect. Three of the lecturers could not be understood readily by their audiences, and two of them dealt too frequently in generalities and platitudes. Only two of the special addresses by prominent Americans materialized. At times some ambiguity arose respecting the exact intent and procedure of one or two of the conferences. In a half-dozen cases the members of the Institute were incompetent and in one or two cases a nuisance. By and large, however, the session was successfully carried out as planned.

When we turn to the plans as drawn, there are a few suggestions to be made. They should only be made, however, after a statement of the object or objects of the Institute. The Institute might be either a super-seminar or a super-chautauqua. As a matter of fact, it was, and probably must necessarily be, more or less of both. The lectures appealed to the amateur interest in international relations, the conferences to the professional interest. Two only of the lecture courses were sufficiently "advanced" to appeal to specialists; only one or two of the conferences were general in character. The lectures ought to be judged from the point of view of the majority of the members of the Institute, who were amateurs, albeit very high grade amateurs, in the field of international relations. The professional student and teacher must judge the Institute primarily by reference to the conferences. This being understood, it remains to be said that the number of lectures might well be diminished and a lecturer obtained from Austria or Germany and from one of the northern European neutral states. Such plans are already entertained for next year.

The number of conferences should be increased. This also will probably be done next summer. Further, the number of persons registered in each conference ought to be, and probably will be, diminished. Finally, visitors will be prevented from hampering—even inadvertently—the thoroughness of the scientific work in the conferences.

The last point suggests the most difficult problem of all. Should members of the Institute not enrolled in a certain conference, not to speak of visitors generally, be allowed to attend that conference and listen to the lecture-discussion? Much benefit is obtained from such visiting; the intensiveness of the discussion by the enrolled members is, however, somewhat impaired thereby. The two aspects of the Institute, as seminar and as chautauqua, come in conflict here.

In the opinion of the writer, it would be well if the conferences could meet in rooms where visitors could be accommodated, but in such a way as not to interfere with the discussions, and they should be prevented from interrupting the discussion in the conference. It may be objected that this would deter members from speaking fully for fear of being quoted, just as it was planned this year to exclude press representatives from the conferences for the same reason. The objection is not serious, if the evidence of the past session is reliable. There was, and must be, too much mixture of people in the conferences in any event to allow a military, naval or diplomatic official to speak too freely. On the other hand, all who were present at Williamstown seemed to be persons of discretion. Finally, the choicer bits of information and interpretation were, as they must be, passed about in conversation outside the formal conferences.

Finally, there should be no misunderstanding regarding the object of the Institute. The intention is not to give a beginner or an intermediate student a systematic course in international law or relations, but rather to offer to the advanced and mature student and the teacher of international law and relations an opportunity to fill out gaps in his background and information, to study certain selected details intensively, and to refresh his thought by a free exchange of ideas. It is not the intention to provide a pleasant vacation for idlers. Those who take part are expected to take part actively and sincerely.

The first session of the Institute was a success, and it provided suggestions for improvement for the next session. The enrollment threatens to be rather large unless rigorously limited in advance. With the Far East included in the subjects of discussion and such names as Redlich, Smuts, and Cecil rumored for lecturers, this may well be expected. It is, at all events, already evident that President Garfield and Mr. Baruch have given American a new and valuable institution of higher education in that, at present, most critical of all fields for study, international law and politics.

PITMAN B. POTTER.

*University of Wisconsin.*

**Lectures and Conferences.**<sup>1</sup> The inaugural exercises of the Institute of Politics were devoted to addresses explaining the circumstances

<sup>1</sup> The following notes were compiled from personal summaries made by the writer, as well as from newspaper reports of the lectures and from abstracts kindly furnished by the secretaries of the several conferences. Owing to the amount of